

Work Group 4 Priority Recommendation

The work group met intermittently during the Task Force Meeting. The following summarizes the priorities discussed by the work group during the February 2-21-08 Task Force Meeting. Jeff Heyduck, Randy Etheridge, John McFadden, Mark Kinsey, and Clinton Neal- Haywood County Solid Waste Director (sitting in for Mayor Franklin Smith) present.

Priority 1-

Funding- Class III/IV landfills should be considered disposal as Class I landfills and should be charged a surcharge of \$0.90/ton (Volume Conversion) to fund needed infrastructure improvement.

- Pros –
 - Treat all disposal as disposal consistently
 - Generate funds
 - Needed to promote waste reduction
 - Segregates wastes for future reuse
 - Discourages disposal
 - Funding would be dedicated to infrastructure improvement
- Cons-
 - If local governments own landfill increases paperwork
 - Public displeasure with higher disposal costs
 - Funds may be re-appropriated into other areas.
 - Never have all the information you need
- Resources
 - More TDEC fiscal services staff
 - Scales maybe needed
- Costs –
 - Administrative costs
- Obstacles-
 - Public perception?
 - Construction related business
- Implementation –
 - Ramped up
 - Set a date start
 - Hire fiscal staff
 - Legislative change

Priority 2-

To implement a [4- Tier Infrastructure Goal](#) that moves local governments to a fully integrated solid waste management system.

- Pros –
 - Continual improvement, Total Quality Management
 - Improved infrastructure
 - Sets a target for infrastructure
 - Clear and defined
 - Gives the regulatory agencies objective evidence of following the “Best Management Practices” that they are seeking
 - Dynamic- addresses local governments by size of population
 - Measuring stick
 - Multi category overall goal for infrastructure.
 - Development districts can use this with needs assessments to set infrastructure needs costs
- Cons-
 - Cost is open ended
 - Someone won’t like it
 - Someone will have to take ownership
- Resources
 - Funding
 - Staffing
 - Land
 - Equipment
 - Computers
 - Packaging
- Costs –
 - Millions
- Obstacles-
 - Funding
 - Someone taking ownership
 - Potential inefficient program if put into the wrong hands or over extended staff
- Implementation –
 - Ramp up from existing infrastructures

Priority 3-

To implement Full Cost Accounting (Disclosure)/ Enterprise Fund Accounting for all Solid Waste and Recycling Programs in local governments.

- Pros –
 - Level playing field for all local governments
 - See the actual cost of solid waste and recycling
 - Treats solid waste as a utility
 - Better forecasting on costs and better budgeting
 - Protects solid waste funding from pork spending
 - Encourage other options other than disposal
 - Educates policy makers
- Cons-
 - Many may be against this
 - Take a while to implement
 - See the actual cost of solid waste recycling
 - More complex than many currently use
 - County commissioners would have a big problem knowing that garbage programs actually cost upwards of \$125/ton instead of \$29/ton
 -
- Resources
 - Accountants
 - Rule making changes
 - Enforcement
 - CTAS
 - Development Districts
 - MTAS for Municipalities
- Costs –
 - Implementation costs
 - Staff costs for continued implementation
 - Attorney fees
- Obstacles-
 - Counties will not want to see the true cost of solid waste and recycling
 - Full disclosure
 - May require a legislative change
 -
- Implementation –
 - Set end date to have in place
 - Set up Utility Review Board or expand Solid Waste Disposal Control Board powers to address this or use existing CAFR report